

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 24 have been amended. Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-14, 22, 24-30 and 33-35 are pending and presented for reconsideration.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for granting a telephone interview on April 13, 2010. During the interview, attorney John Laurence clarified that lead angles recited in independent claims 1 and 24 are meant to define an angle at which a thread is disposed on the second component and not an angle of a threads leading edge. The Examiner noted that the claims needed to be amended to more clearly define this limitation. Although exact wording was not agreed upon, the Examiner suggested the use of the word “disposed” and also suggested that the lead angles should be “relative to the open end of the second component.” In the Interview Summary dated April 15, 2010, the Examiner states that, “after reviewing Fig. 4 and Column 7, lines 10-17 of Stines (US Patent 5,290,260), it was agreed that the prior art does not disclose the threads as seen in Fig. 14 of the instant application.” However, the Examiner also stated in the Advisory Action that “the instant claims do not set forth alternating threads having a first angle and a second angle with respect to the open end of the fastener component.”

Consistent with the Examiner’s suggestion during the telephone interview, independent claims 1 and 24 have been amended to recite “at least one of the threads of said second component member disposed on said second component member and extending along its length at a first lead angle relative to the open end of said second component member and at least another one of the threads of said second component member disposed on said second component member and extending along its entire length at a second lead angle relative to the open end of said second component member and disposed between two of the threads of the second component member disposed at the first lead angle, the first and second lead angles being

different and the first lead angle being the same as the predetermined lead angle of the threads of the first component member.”

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-14, 22, 24-30 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that, in the independent claims, it is not clear between what two of the threads the at least another of the threads is disposed (Office Action, page 2, line 10). Independent claims 1 and 24 have been amended to recite that the at least another one of the threads is “disposed between two of the threads of the second component member disposed at the first lead angle.” Applicants believe that claims 1 and 24, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly recite that the at least another thread disposed at a second lead angle is itself disposed between two threads disposed at the first lead angle. As such, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 24, and their dependent claims, under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-14, 22, 24-30 and 33-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey (US Patent 4,346,920) in view of Stines (US Patent 5,290,260) and as evidenced by Jochem (US Patent 7,097,790). As discussed above, applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 24 consistent with the Examiner’s suggestion during the telephone interview. Therefore, as noted by the Examiner in the Interview Summary, independent claims 1 and 24, and their dependent claims, are patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited art.

For the record, applicants note that Stines, as shown in Fig. 3, discloses a plurality of threads 134-137 disposed on an elongated member 104, each thread having respective leading

flank surfaces 147-150 and pressure flank surface 151-154 (Column 7, lines 1-4). The leading 147-150 and pressure 151-154 flank surfaces may have different flank angles as well as having different leading an pressure flank angles on each or the plurality of threads 134-137 (Col. 7, lines 11-14). However, as stated the Interview Summary, Stines does not disclose at least one on the elongated member 104 at a second angle relative to the elongated member 104 that is different than a first lead angle relative to the elongated member at which the remaining thread are disposed on the elongated member 104.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1 and 24, and their respective dependent claims, thus patentably distinguish over the cited art. It is therefore requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Dated: April 26, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John Laurence
Reg. No. 63,383

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-6799
(212) 790-9200